REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-32 were rejected by the Examiner in the above-identified Office Action. In this response, no claim has been amended, cancelled or added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-32 remain pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the subject action, the Examiner maintained the rejections against Claims 1-4. 10-22 and 28-32 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,850,548 to Williams (hereinafter, Williams). In response, Applicant thanks the Examiner for detailed action and response to arguments, but respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

In the last response, Applicant argued that Williams failed to clearly teach at least the recitations "*the first action cell being associated with causing at least a first action to be performed in association with or on behalf of at least one of a third display container cell and a fourth display container cell, the first action being performed in response to a user selection of the first action cell, and the first, second, third and fourth display container cells being different display container cells.*"

Applicants specifically argued that

"The passage <relied by the Examiner> is associated with adding a new property too a "component' selected by a designer in the course of designing an application using the components provided by the disclosed visual application development environment. A component under Williams, as clearly defined in col. 3, lines 50-57, is a "Fundamental System Unit. Does all processing; receives and send messages. In an exemplary embodiments, "atomic" or "sub-components" will typically be crated in a high level programming language, such as C++ or Pascal. "Composite" or "super components" on the other hand, will typically be created using visual programming or scripting techniques." Thus, elements 620 and 625 of Fig 6c are icon representations of the

- 7 -

components having been selected for inclusion into the application being designed. Nothing in Williams teaches that "on user selection of" one of these 620 or 625 icon representations, an "action" will be performed "in association with or on behalf of a third or fourth display container cell" (that are different from a first or second display container cells within which the icon representation 620 or 625 is rendered).

Element 650 is a window of visual editor that facilitates the designer in adding property to the selected component 625. Element 651 is an icon representation of the Slider property. Element 652 is a pop-up menu. Elements 653 are choices within the pop-up menu. Element 652 (having elements 653) is displayed in response to a "right click" while the cursor is in hovering over element 651. As is well known to those of ordinary skill, right click is NOT selection of an icon. Right click conventionally is a technique through which a user asks the system for a list of selections associated with the icon. In the example, the list of selections are the property choices available under the property menu. Thus, none of these elements teach "an action cell" where "on user selection of" one of these 650, 651, 652, 653 window, icon representation, menu list or menu entry, an "action" will be performed "in association with or on behalf of a third or fourth display container cell" (that are different from a first or second display container cells within which the icon representation of the element is rendered)."

In response, the Examiner stated in the action:

"Examiner respectfully disagrees. In patent examination, USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d, 1027-28 (Fed Cir 1997). In this case, *the selection of the component through right clicking on the icon (which is given as an example, not definition of the selection technique in William anticipates the selection of an action cell described by the independent claims."*

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the Examiner may give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation. However, that is not the issue here. *The issue here is, for § 102 rejections, the law requires the relied reference to clearly and unambiguously teach what is being claimed.* The Examiner admitted in the response to arguments, the office action "gave an example (paraphrased)." And that the "example" is "*not definition of the selection technique in William anticipates the selection of an action cell described by the independent claims.*" However, without specific citation what the Examiner considered as the definition of William's selection technique, Applicant is unable to respond to that. Therefore, Applicant can only respond to the cited "example."

With respect to the specific "example" passage cited by the examiner, which says "The user requests property inspection of the Slider 651 which appears in the visual editor 650 (e.g. by right-clicking on *it* ..." There is no ambuity that the pronoun "*it*" refers to the **visual editor 650**. So if the right click on **visual editor 650** is to be interpreted as reading on the recited phrase of "*user selection of the first action cell.*" Then, the inescapable conclusion is the examiner is attempting to read **visual editor 650** as "*the first action cell.*" But the alleged "action cell" **visual editor 650** is the window in focus, on top of the "library" window, the "visual component 1" window and the window containing the element "Edit1." Alleged "action cell" **visual editor 650** is not an element **nested** in anything, let alone meeting the recitation of "*a first action cell nested within one of said first and second display container cells*" where "<the> second display container cell <is>> nested within the first display container cell." Further the effect of the right click on alleged "action cell" **visual editor 650** is the display of pop up 652 within **visual editor 650**. Therefore, the effect of the selection of the alleged "action cell" **visual editor 650** is modification of the alleged "action cell" **visual editor 650** itself, and not "*...associated or on behalf of at least one of a third display container cell and a fourth display container cell*" where the *third and fourth display container cells* are different from the *first and second container cells*, where the *action cell* is nested.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the specific passages provided by the Examiner to support his position simply does not meet the requirements of the law for § 102 rejections.

Once again, claim 1 clearly recites a method for providing an user interface on a display that requires

"a *first action cell* nested within one of *said first and second display container cells*," where "<the> second display container cell <is> nested within the first display container cell,"

where "the first action cell <is> associated with causing at least a first action to be performed in association with or on behalf of at least one of *a third display container cell and a fourth display container cell*,

where the third or fourth display container cell, on which or on behalf the action is to be performed is different from the first or second display container cell where the action cell is nested.

So claim 1 clearly recites *five* elements, *first action cell, first, second, third and fourth display container cells*. Further claim 1 recites *disposition relationships* between the first action cell and the first and second display container cells, as well as *functional relationships* between the first action cell and the third and fourth display container cells (which are different from the first or second display container cell where the first action cell is nested).

If the Examiner is to maintain the rejections again, Applicant would very much appreciate the Examiner identifying 5 similar elements in Williams, A, B, C, D and E, where A is of a first type (action cell), and B, C, D, and E are of another type (display container cells), where A has *disposition relationships* to B and C, as well as having *functional relationships* with D and E.

- 10 -

Without that, Applicant respectfully submits Williams does not clearly and unambiguously teaches the inventive method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Williams under § 102(b).

Amended claim 28 includes recitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Accordingly, for at least similar reasons, claim 28 is patentable over Williams.

Claims 2-4, 10-22, and 29-32 depend from either claim 1 or 28, incorporating their recitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-4, 10-22, and 29-32 are patentable over Williams.

<u>Conclusion</u>

In light of the above amendments and remarks, claims 1-4, 10-22, and 28-32 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 381-8819.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: November 11, 2009   by: /Al AuYeung/
                                       Al AuYeung
                                       Reg. No. 35,432

US Bank Centre
1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3010
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: 206-622-1711